

REMARKS

The rejection of claims 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, for failure to comply with the written description requirement is respectfully traversed. Claim 16 corresponds to claim 7 starting from the time when the mixing recited in claim 7 has been done. Claim 17 through 20 are clearly described since they correspond to other claims to which this rejection has not been applied. Nevertheless, basis in the specification can be found, *inter alia*, as follows.

The last paragraph on page 3 of the application refers to preparing a powdered mixture by mixing a titanium oxide powder comprising titanium oxide particles having a barium compound present on the surfaces of the particles and a powder containing barium. It is clear that as a result of this mixing, a powder mixture is provided. The last sentence in the paragraph states that the provided powder mixture is calcined. Accordingly, claim 16 is fully described in the application. The amount of barium per mol of titanium recited in claim 17 is set forth in the first paragraph on page 4 of the application and the specific surface areas recited in claims 18 and 20 is set forth in the second paragraph on page 4. The thicknesses recited in claims 19 and 20 find basis in the third full paragraph on page 6 of the application.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, can be withdrawn in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In claim 1, antecedent basis for the solvent-free mixture and titanium oxide powder particles has been provided and it is respectfully submitted that in so doing, the asserted indefiniteness and confusion with regard to the powder being made has been eliminated. The Examiner will note that the titanium oxide powder particles which have the barium on its surfaces is designated a titanium oxide powder "material".

The heating step in claims 2, 3, 11 and 12 has been provided with antecedent basis by amending these claim to refer to "said heating".

Claims 16 and 17 have been revised to make it clear that the barium compound is on the surfaces of the titanium oxide powder particles. Claim 18 has been amended to use the same terminology as in the claim on which it is dependent thereby providing antecedent basis. Claim 16 has been amended to provide the antecedent basis for the reference to particles in claim 20 and to use the same terminology with regard to the powder as used in the claims on which it is dependent.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over JP'943 can be withdrawn in light of the foregoing amendment to recite the amount of the barium which is on the surfaces of the titanium. As previously pointed out, the Japanese reference does not teach or suggest attaching a small amount of barium to the titanium oxide powder. The Examiner noted that this feature had not been recited in the rejected claims and this amendment incorporates that feature into all of these rejected claims.

Application No. 10/677,373
Amendment dated March 22, 2007
After Final Office Action of February 20, 2007

Docket No.: M1071.1869

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Edward A. Meilman/
Edward A. Meilman
Registration No.: 24,735
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant